

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name:	Lander's Fork Land Banking Proposal
Proposed Implementation Date:	Winter 2008
Proponent:	DNRC
Location:	Sale #520, Approximately 76.3 acres in Lot 3_NE4SW4 of Sec. 18, Township 15 North, West
County:	Lewis & Clark County

I. TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION

Offer for Sale at Public Auction, 76.3 acres of State Land currently held in Trust for the benefit of State Industrial School Trust (see Attachment A – Map). Revenue generated from the sale of this parcel would be deposited into a special account to be used to purchase replacement lands meeting acquisition criteria related to legal access, productivity, potential income generation and potential for multiple use. Replacement lands would then be held in Trust for the benefit of State Industrial School Trust. This proposed sale is being initiated through the Land Banking program (Montana Code Annotated 77-2-361 through 77-2-367) that was approved by the Legislature in 2003. The purpose of this program is to allow the Department of Natural Resources and Conservation to dispose primarily of parcels that are isolated and produce low income relative to similarly classified tracts and to allow the Department to purchase land with legal public access that can support multiple uses and will provide a rate of return equal to or greater than the parcels that were sold. Additionally, this program allows for the Trust land portfolio to be diversified, by disposing of grazing parcels that make up a majority of the Trust land holdings and acquire other types of land, such as cropland or timberlands, which typically produce greater return on investment.

II. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED:

Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.

DNRC prepared and distributed a letter dated March 10th, 2008, describing the proposal and requesting comments be submitted by April 10, 2008. This letter was sent to interested parties including adjacent landowners, the Lewis & Clark County Commissioners, State, Federal, and Tribal agencies, Special Interest Groups and the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee who participated in writing the Administrative Rules for the Land Banking Program. A complete list of the individuals contacted is included in Attachment B of this EA.

A legal notice was published in the Helena Independent Record on March 11, 2008 and in the Blackfoot Valley Dispatch on March 13, 2008 requesting comments be submitted on the proposal by April 10th, 2008.

Letters were received from Fish Wildlife & Parks, Lewis & Clark County Planner, and the Grazing Licensee in response to this proposal. Comments applicable to the Land Banking proposal were considered in developing issues that are analyzed in this EA.

OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:

None

3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

Proposed Alternative: Offer approximately 76.3 acres of State Land for sale at Public Auction and subject to statutes addressing the Sale of State Land found in Title 77, Chapter 2, Part 3 of the Montana Codes Annotated. Proceeds from the sale would be deposited in the Land Bank Fund to be used in conjunction with proceeds from other sales for the purchase of other state land, easements, or improvements for the beneficiaries of the respective trusts, in this case State Industrial Schools. However, per M.C.A. 77-2-304 the State would retain the subsurface mineral rights.

No Action Alternative: Defer inclusion of this parcel in the Land Banking Program. Maintain state ownership of this parcel and continue to manage the property for revenue to the State Industrial School Trust.

III. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

- *RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.*
- *Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading.*
- *Enter "NONE" if no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.*

4. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE:

Consider the presence of fragile, compactable or unstable soils. Identify unusual geologic features. Specify any special reclamation considerations. Identify any cumulative impacts to soils.

Proposed Alternative/No Action Alternative:

No sites with unique geology or unstable slopes were identified on the parcel proposed for exchange. The area is gently sloping forested terrain with moderate to deep glacial and alluvial deposits. Predominant soils are deep Worock stony loam soils on 8-35 percent slopes with local pockets of soils with higher clay contents in subsoils that remain wet late into the spring. Worock soils are well drained soils and tend to be droughty and support mixed conifer stands. Erosion potential is low to moderate on these soils with gentle to moderate slopes. Historic management has been selective timber harvest and grazing of range sites. No EPA Toxic Release Sites or DEQ Remediation sites are located on this parcel. No soil disturbance activities are planned as part of this action.

There would be low risk of direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to geology and soil quality, stability and moisture as a result of implementing the proposed action or no-action alternatives.

5. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION:

Identify important surface or groundwater resources. Consider the potential for violation of ambient water quality standards, drinking water maximum contaminant levels, or degradation of water quality. Identify cumulative effects to water resources.

Proposed Alternative/No Action Alternative:

This parcel of land is located east of Lincoln, Montana, within the Lander's Fork drainage, which is tributary to the Blackfoot River. An intermittent tributary stream to Lander's Fork crosses this parcel of land. Spring runoff quickly percolates deep into this coarse gravelly outwash terrain and this intermittent tributary is typically dry in the summer months. No water rights occur on this DNRC parcel or on the unnamed tributary segment directly downstream of the DNRC property. No pollution related impairments have been identified for this tributary or Lander's Fork. Thus, there is low risk of direct, indirect or cumulative effects to water quality or beneficial uses anticipated with both the action and no-action alternative on these parcels of the proposed actions.

No direct or cumulative impacts to water quality are anticipated as a result of the proposal.

6. AIR QUALITY:

What pollutants or particulate would be produced? Identify air quality regulations or zones (e.g. Class I air shed) the project would influence. Identify cumulative effects to air quality.

Proposed Alternative/No Action Alternative:

The parcel is located approximately ten (10) miles northeast of Lincoln, MT in Lewis & Clark County. Air quality is currently good. Impacts to air quality may result from a variety of activities including road use, agricultural burning, wildfires, industrial development, and vehicle emissions or heating system emissions among others.

The parcel is a very small percentage of the valley air shed and we do not expect direct or cumulative effects would occur to air quality as a result of the proposal.

7. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY:

What changes would the action cause to vegetative communities? Consider rare plants or cover types that would be affected. Identify cumulative effects to vegetation.

Proposed Alternative/No Action Alternative:

The property contains a mosaic of forest and grassland vegetation types. Approximately 59 acres are forested, with the remainder (17 acres) being grassy meadows.

Noxious weeds, principally Spotted knapweed (*Centaurea maculosa*) occurs throughout the area across ownerships, and also on the DNRC parcel, mainly in lower density due to the forest overstory. There would be minimal if any change in noxious weeds with the proposed action..

No direct, indirect or cumulative effects are anticipated to occur to vegetation as a result of the proposed action.

8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS:

Consider substantial habitat values and use of the area by wildlife, birds or fish. Identify cumulative effects to fish and wildlife.

Proposed Alternative/No Action Alternative:

Big Game—The affected parcel is summer range for elk; and spring, summer, and fall range for mule deer. Currently, an adjacent landowner seasonally grazes livestock on the affected parcel (8 AUM's per year). Under the proposed action, should livestock grazing continue, there would likely be little difference in effects between the no action alternative and the proposed action. Additionally, the proposed action would limit development, through deed restrictions, to 1 residence, with a limited footprint, on 27 acres. The 49-acre proposed No Build Zone (Exhibit C) contains suitable habitat for elk and mule deer, including a meadow/ephemeral wetland, and hiding cover in forested stands consisting of Douglas-fir, ponderosa pine, and lodgepole pine. As a result, there would likely be low risk of direct, indirect, or cumulative effects to big game from the proposed action.

There are no streams, and hence, no fisheries within the DNRC parcel. There would be no direct, in-direct or cumulative effects to aquatic life or fish with implementation of the action or no-action alternatives.

9. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES:

Consider any federally listed threatened or endangered species or habitat identified in the project area. Determine effects to wetlands. Consider Sensitive Species or Species of special concern. Identify cumulative effects to these species and their habitat.

Proposed Alternative/No Action Alternative:

Grizzly Bear (federally threatened)—The proposed action would auction the affected parcel to the highest bidder. The affected parcel is located within the Monture Landers Fork Bear Management Unit of the Northern Continental Divide Ecosystem grizzly bear recovery zone, and likely receives use by this species. The parcel is partially forested, with a mix of Douglas-fir, ponderosa pine, and lodgepole pine, and a meadow complex that is ephemerally irrigated in spring and early summer.

To mitigate the potential for impacts to grizzly bears from potential development of the parcel in the future, DNRC will implement the following two deed restrictions as mitigations as part of the proposed action. There will be a deed restriction prohibiting subdivision and exemption to subdivision restricting development to one (1) dwelling unit on the parcel, with the possibility for out-buildings outside of a No Build Zone. A 39 acre No Build Zone has been designated (Exhibit C) and defined to prohibit development but does not preclude road construction. The No Build Zone was identified to conserve important hiding cover and ephemeral wetlands for grizzly bear use. The second mitigation is a deed restriction for Wildlife reservations (Exhibit D) and would: regulate food attractants; and allow enforcement of the Wildlife Deed restrictions by DNRC, Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks, the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and Lewis and Clark County. The deed restrictions will be filed with the Lewis and Clark County Clerk and Recorder as a Development Agreement. With implementation and enforcement of the wildlife deed restrictions, it is likely that there would be low risk of direct, indirect, or cumulative effects to grizzly bears from the proposed action.

Gray Wolves (federally endangered)—The affected parcel is on the periphery of the Monitor Mountain wolf pack 2007 home range. Through implementation and enforcement of the deed restrictions (e.g., restricting food attractants, No Build Zone, etc.), potential development of the parcel in the future would likely have minimal effects to gray wolves. Currently, an adjoining landowner seasonally grazes cattle on the affected parcel (8 AUM's per year). Should livestock grazing continue on this parcel under the proposed action, there would likely be no difference in risk of effects to wolves between the no action alternative and the proposed action. Thus, there would likely be low risk of direct, indirect, or cumulative effects to wolves as a result of the proposed action.

Canada Lynx (federally threatened)—There are approximately 12 acres of mature foraging/denning habitat, and approximately 3 acres of other lynx habitat in the southwest corner of the affected parcel, all of which would be within the proposed No Build Zone (Exhibit C) under the proposed action. With the proposed mitigations, there would likely be low risk of direct, indirect, or cumulative effects to lynx from the proposed action.

No fish species, wetlands or sensitive plants occur on the DNRC parcel. There would be no direct, in-direct or cumulative effects to aquatic life or fish with implementation of the action or no-action alternatives.

10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES:

Identify and determine effects to historical, archaeological or paleontological resources.

Proposed Alternative/No Action Alternative:

A Class III intensity level inventory of cultural resources of Section 18, T15N R7W was conducted. No Heritage Properties as defined at the Montana State Antiquities Act were identified during the course of inspection. As such, no additional archaeological investigative work is recommended for this property.

11. AESTHETICS:

Determine if the project is located on a prominent topographic feature, or may be visible from populated or scenic areas. What level of noise, light or visual change would be produced? Identify cumulative effects to aesthetics.

Proposed Alternative/No Action Alternative:

There are no prominent topographic features on the state land. The parcel is located within a valley and is not visible to the public. The state land does not provide any unique scenic quality that is not also provided by adjacent lands.

No direct or cumulative impact to aesthetics is anticipated as result of the proposal.

12. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR OR ENERGY:

Determine the amount of limited resources the project would require. Identify other activities nearby that the project would affect. Identify cumulative effects to environmental resources.

Proposed Alternative/No Action Alternative:

This 76 acre parcel is part of the State Industrial School Trust of which there are more than 85,309 acres within the state. The statutes limit the sale of trust land to a maximum of 20,000 acres prior to purchasing replacement lands. The potential sale of this parcel would affect an extremely small percentage of the State Industrial School Trust land if replacement land was not purchased before the statute expires and even less impact if replacement land is purchased as anticipated.

The potential transfer of ownership would not have any impact or demands on environmental resources of land, water, air or energy.

13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA:

List other studies, plans or projects on this tract. Determine cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of current private, state or federal actions in the analysis area, and from future proposed state actions in the analysis area that are under MEPA review (scoped) or permitting review by any state agency.

Proposed Alternative/No Action Alternative:

Grazing Lease Range Evaluations – Evaluations have been conducted on this parcel and are in the Department files.

DNRC/CS&KT Land Exchange – This project was publicly scoped in the local (Lincoln) newspaper on September 18, 2008. DNRC is proposing to acquire approximately 514 acres of land located about 2 miles north of the town of Lincoln, MT from the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes for a similar acreage of school trust land in the South Fork of the Jocko Tribal Primitive area (Approximately 12 miles east of Arlee, MT). The proposed acquisition is approximately 10 miles southwest of the land banking parcel. The effects of this land acquisition (if successful) would tend to offset the effects of the loss of state acreage due to this land banking proposal.

Golden Arches & Old McDonald Timber Sales – These two state timber sales involve three sections of school trust land within a five mile vicinity of the land banking proposal (Section 6 T14N-R7W, Section 12, T14N-R8W, Sec 36, T15N-R8W. Both timber sales were analyzed for environmental effects in accordance with the Montana Environmental Policy Act (MEPA). Both sales were sold and are currently under contract. The Purchaser has yet to initiate on-the-ground activities. There is a slight possibility of increased human activities occurring in the next 5 years in this area associated with the combined actions of these projects.

Whiskey Gulch Salvage Timber Sale - This proposed timber sale has been publicly scoped and is currently in the environmental analysis phase. This timber sale involves one section of school trust land (Section 36 T15N-R7W) and is located approximately 5 miles southeast of the land banking proposal. The project involves salvage harvest of Douglas fir, spruce and true fir trees defoliated by western spruce budworm and salvage of lodgepole pine trees infested with mountain pine beetles. Because this timber sale proposal is located on the other (south) side of a major highway (Highway 200), and proposed activities are quite different, cumulative effects should be minimal.

Reclamation on McDonald Meadows – Gold exploration has been ongoing on DNRC and private lands approximately 3 ½ miles south of the land banking parcel for the last 10 years. A law banning the use of cyanide heap leaching for gold recovery has impacted plans for development of a major gold mine at this site. Primary activities at this time involve reclamation of roads and drill sites used in exploration of the mineral deposit.

The cumulative effects of reclamation activities, particularly road obliteration and weed control would tend to offset any potential development activities that might occur as a result of the land banking proposal.

Keep Cool Hills Cooperative Road Management – The Montana Department of Fish Wildlife and Parks (FWP) entered into a cooperative agreement with the Sieben Ranch, Montana DNRC and the US Forest Service to manage road use within the Keep Cool Hills area. Sieben Ranch was threatening to close their property to motorized public use unless something was done to better control use. A cooperative agreement and a road use plan were developed for the area. FWP is now enforcing public use on this area (located approximately 5 miles southeast of the land banking proposal)

Other than this, there are no known state or federal actions in the vicinity, or known future actions proposed by the state, which would have cumulative impacts with this proposal.

IV. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION

- *RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.*
- *Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading.*
- *Enter "NONE" if no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.*

14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY:

Identify any health and safety risks posed by the project.

Proposed Alternative/No Action Alternative:

No impacts to human health and safety would occur as a result of the sale proposal.

15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURE ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION:

Identify how the project would add to or alter these activities.

Proposed Alternative/No Action Alternative:

The parcel of land is currently licensed for summer livestock grazing purposes with an estimated annual carrying capacity of 8 AUM's. The current licensee, COURTESY LAND & LIVESTOCK CO. owns acreage to the North and East of the parcel. The location of the property is not conducive to industrial or commercial development.

The forested portions of this tract are suitable for commercial timber production. Productivity is low to moderate (70 cubic feet per acre per year). Much of the area is sapling and pole sized trees. The current merchantable volume of sawlogs is estimated at 93 thousand board feet. Due to the small area and the relatively low volume of merchantable timber, there is little opportunity for commercial timber harvest until the trees grow larger (20 or more years).

This tract is located about 3 miles north of the previously identified ore body at McDonald Meadows. Based on the footprint of the SUPJV mine plan proposal, this tract would have been about 1-1/2 to 2 miles north of mine activities. It was not leased in connection with the project proposal. State oil and gas has been leased from time-to-time in this township from the late 70s to early 00s. The most recent oil and gas leasing activity was in 2003, with those leases being dropped in 2005. The nearest exploration well was a dry hole drilled about 9 miles east-southeast of the nominated tract. This and other state lands are unleased for minerals in this and adjoining townships at this time.

Any future change in land use would be subject to review under state and local regulations intended to address impacts to local industrial, commercial and agricultural activities. No direct or cumulative impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposal. Per M.C.A. 77-2-304 the State would retain the subsurface mineral rights.

16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT:

Estimate the number of jobs the project would create, move or eliminate. Identify cumulative effects to the employment market.

Proposed Alternative/No Action Alternative:

The proposed sale would have no effect on quantity and distribution of employment.

17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES:

Estimate tax revenue the project would create or eliminate. Identify cumulative effects to taxes and revenue.

Proposed Alternative/No Action Alternative:

Currently the parcel is not assessed taxes. The sale would put new land on the county tax base, thus increasing revenue to Lewis & Clark County.

18. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES:

Estimate increases in traffic and changes to traffic patterns. What changes would be needed to fire protection, police, schools, etc.? Identify cumulative effects of this and other projects on government services

Proposed Alternative/No Action Alternative:

The proposed sale would not have an impact on government services.

Any future uses including development of the parcel would be subject to applicable local and state regulations.

19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS:

List State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, and other zoning or management plans, and identify how they would affect this project.

Proposed Alternative/No Action Alternative:

The parcel is unzoned. Chapter 8 (page VIII-3) of Lincoln's Growth Policy states, "The 2003 Lewis and Clark Growth Policy lists development areas as urban, transitional or rural. All of the Lincoln Planning Area is classified as "rural". "

The DNRC manages state trust lands for residential development under the Real Estate Management Plan. The Plan defines residential development as one residential unit per 25 acres or less. As a condition of the proposed sale of this property, DNRC will restrict the development of the state trust lands to limit subdivision and exemptions to subdivision review allowing a maximum of one (1) dwelling unit on the 76 acres encompassed by Section 18. This restriction will be addressed in the Deed Agreement and filed as a Development Agreement with the Lewis & Clark County Clerk and Recorder.

20. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES:

Identify any wilderness or recreational areas nearby or access routes through this tract. Determine the effects of the project on recreational potential within the tract. Identify cumulative effects to recreational and wilderness activities.

Proposed Alternative/No Action Alternative:

This tract of State land is not legally accessible to the public and does not provide access to any recreational or wilderness areas in the vicinity.

This tract is located near the Helena National Forest boundary, but does not provide access to the forest. While the tract has desirable recreational qualities, public use is severely limited due to the lack of legal access. Only three adjoining property owners are able to access the parcel via walk-in opportunities due to adjacent property borders.

Legal permanent access to the proposed sale tract has not been perfected. Currently, access is provided via Lander's Fork Road, which functions as a county road, and a spur route off of Lander's Fork through a 100 acre tract of land owned by Michael Kovelenco. It should be noted that status of Lander's Fork Road as a legally situated county road is stymied by the lack of legal access through another state trust parcel (Section 36, T15N, R8W) to the south.

Certified, registered letters were sent on August 26, 2008, to property owners (Lydiard, Courtesy Land and Livestock) known to be utilizing the proposed land banking parcel (Section 18) for access, per requirements outlined in ARM 36.25.803. Upon further research, it was found that the state originally acquired Section 18, the proposed sale parcel, from Lydiards through a Land Exchange in 1987. At the time of the property transfer between Lydiard and the State of Montana, an easement (see easement document, Exhibit E) was reserved to preserve state access through the parent parcel (Lydiards). While installing a fence between the state purchase and the parent parcel, in 1998, an error (see internal memo, Exhibit F) was found in that reservation which showed that the easement reserved to the state should have been reserved to Lydiards. Due to this administrative error, the state will acknowledge the easement to Lydiards through the state parcel prior to the sale.

21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING:

Estimate population changes and additional housing the project would require. Identify cumulative effects to population and housing.

Proposed Alternative/No Action Alternative:

The potential sale of this parcel could result in additional housing or impact population changes. However, development on the parcel would be limited to a one (1) dwelling unit maximum development restriction and will be addressed in the Deed Agreement and filed as a Development Agreement with the Lewis & Clark County Clerk and Recorder.

22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES:

Identify potential disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities.

Proposed Alternative/No Action Alternative:

There are no native, unique or traditional lifestyles or communities in the vicinity that would be impacted by either alternative.

23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY:

How would the action affect any unique quality of the area?

Proposed Alternative/No Action Alternative:

The potential sale of the state land will not directly or cumulatively impact cultural uniqueness or diversity.

24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:

Estimate the return to the trust. Include appropriate economic analysis. Identify potential future uses for the analysis area other than existing management. Identify cumulative economic and social effects likely to occur as a result of the proposed action.

No Action Alternative:

The parcel is classified forest land (principally valuable for timber or for the growing of timber or for watershed protection 77-1-401 MCA). Since DNRC acquired the parcel in a 1987 land exchange, there has been no commercial timber harvesting. As noted in Section 15, the site is low to moderate in timber productivity, the current volume of merchantable sawlogs is low, and there are no prospects of commercial timber harvest within the next 20 years.

On a broad scale this parcel is less productive than the statewide average for other classified forest lands.

The parcel currently has a Grazing License authorizing seasonal (summer) use of up to 8 Animal Unit Months of forage per year (approximately 10 acres per AUM). The current rental is \$6.94/AUM thereby generating an income of \$55.52 annually or approximately \$0.73/acre.

Overall this parcel is considered below average in productivity and producing less than average revenue per acre. The parcel is surrounded by private lands and does not have legal access. There is no indication that this inaccessible parcel, if remaining in state ownership, would be used for purposes other than forestry and grazing and it is likely the future income would remain relatively stable.

An appraisal of the property value has not been completed. Assuming an appraised value of \$3000/acre, grazing income of \$55.52 and timber income of \$0 over a 20 year period, the current annual income return for this parcel is 0.03% with a net present value of \$998.

Proposed Action Alternative:

Land Banking statute requires that land acquired as replacement property through Land Banking is "likely to produce more net revenue for the affected trust than the revenue that was produced from the land that was sold" (Section 77-2-364 MCA). Property targeted for acquisition could include agricultural or timber lands, with recreational opportunities or commercial potential. All these land classifications or uses presently produce a higher rate of return on State Trust land than the average parcel of State Trust grazing parcel.

EA Checklist Prepared By:	Name: Elizabeth Mullins	Date: 10/30/2008
	Title: Land Use Planner	

V. FINDING

25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:

I have selected the proposed alternative with the prohibition of subdivision and exceptions to subdivision review for a maximum of one (1) dwelling unit and wildlife deed restrictions as mitigations noted in items #9 and #19 and the administrative error in the road easement in #20 . I recommend the parcel receive preliminary approval for sale and continue with the Land Banking process.

26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:

I have evaluated the comments received and potential environment effects and have determined significant environmental impacts would not result from the proposed land sale. The parcel does not have any unique characteristics; critical habitat or environmental conditions indicating the parcel should necessarily remain under management by the Department of Natural Resources and Conservation.

I believe the mitigation found under Section 9 UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: for a restriction on subdivision and exemption to subdivision allowing only one (1) dwelling unit on the 76 acres, a no build zone and wildlife reservations address concerns for wildlife habitat. The mitigation under Section 19, LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS, for a restriction to one dwelling unit developed on the parcel, addresses concerns related to potential adverse impacts to development caps contained within the DNRC Real Estate Management Plan. The acknowledgement of access to the Lydiard property noted in Section 20, ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES address the access concerns associated with the proposed land sale.

I have reviewed the comments and believe that all concerns have been adequately addressed under the appropriate headings.

27. NEED FOR FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:

☐ EIS

☐ More Detailed EA

☒ No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Approved By:	Name:	Anthony L. Liane
	Title:	Southwestern Land Office Area Manager
Signature:		Date:

EXHIBIT A



Land Banking Nomination for 76.3 Acres

T 15 N, R 7 W Section 18 Lot 3 NE4SW4




EXHIBIT B

Landers Fork

Courtesy Land & Livestock Co.
10952 E. MT Highway 200
Lincoln, MT 59639

Rick Ripley
8920 Montana Highway 200
Wolf Creek, MT 59648-8639

John Cobb
P.O. Box 388
Augusta, MT 59410-0388

Amber Kamps
Helena National Forest, Lincoln
Ranger District, 7269 Highway
200, Lincoln, MT 59644

Ed Tinsley
316 North Park Avenue
Helena, MT 59623

Mike Murray
316 North Park Avenue
Helena, MT 59623

Anita Varone
316 North Park Avenue
Helena, MT 59623

Chris Servheen
Grizzly Bear Recovery Office
Main Hall 309
University of Montana
Missoula, MT 59812

Jeff Hagener, Director
Dept. of Fish, Wildlife & Parks
P.O. Box 200701
Helena, MT 59620-0701

Mack Long
Dept. Of Fish, Wildlife & Parks
3201 Spurgin Road
Missoula, MT 59804

Sharon Rose
Dept. Of Fish, Wildlife & Parks
3201 Spurgin Road
Missoula, MT 59804

Department of Environmental
Quality
1520 East 6th Avenue
Helena, MT 59620

Environmental Quality Council
PO Box 201704
Helena, MT 59620-1704

Nancy Anderson
Bureau of Land Management
Missoula Resource Area
3255 Fort Missoula Road
Missoula, MT 59804

Tribal Historic Preservation Office
Confederated Salish and Kootenai
Tribe
P. O. Box 278
Pablo, MT 59855

Jerry Sorenson
Plum Creek Timber Company LP
PO Box 1990
Columbia Falls, MT 59912

Montana Wilderness Association
P.O. Box 635
Helena, MT 59624

Montana Audubon Council
Attn. Janet Ellis
PO Box 595
Helena, MT 59624

MontRIST
P.O. BOX 1111
Missoula Mt 59806

Five Valley's Land Trust
117 West Broadway
Missoula, Mt 59802

Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation
PO Box 8249
Missoula, Mt 59807-8249

Friends of the Wild Swan
PO Box 5103
Swan Lake, MT 59911

Jeff Juel, Ecosystem Defense
Wildwest Institute
PO Box 7998
Missoula, MT 59807

Alliance for the Wild Rockies
P. O. Box 8731
Missoula, MT 59807

Jay Hodner, Natural Resources
Director
Montana Stockgrowers Assn.
420 North California
Helena, MT 59601

Montana Smart Growth Coalition
Tim Davis
PO Box 543
Helena, MT 59624

Ric Smith, Chairman
Trout Unlimited
PO Box 7186
Missoula, MT 59807

Montana Environmental Information
Center
Attn. Anne Hedges
PO Box 1184
Helena, MT 59624

Montana River Action Network
Attn. Donald Kern
PO Box 383
Helena, MT 59624

Montana Wildlife Federation
Attn. Dave Majors
3289 Wood Duck Lane
Stevensville, MT 59870

Western Montana Fish & Game
Association
c/o Jim Clawson
11225 Windemere
Missoula, MT 59801

Stuart Lewin
615 3rd Avenue North
Great Falls, MT 59401

Monte Cooper, President
Public Lands Access Assoc., Inc.
P. O. Box 3902
Bozeman, MT 59772-3902

Hellgate Hunters & Anglers
PO Box 7792
Missoula, MT 59807

National Wildlife Federation
Attn Rich Day
240 N Higgins Ave
Missoula, MT 59802

Brian Schwietzer, Governor
c/o Mike Volesky
PO BOX 200801
State Capitol
Helena, MT 59620-0801

Linda McCulloch, OPI Superintendent
c/o Rusty Harper
1227 11th Ave
PO Box 202501
Helena, MT 59620-2501

Dept of Fish, Wildlife & Parks
Attn: Hugh Zacheim
PO Box 200701
Helena, MT 59620-0701

Bill Orsello/Sten Frasier
MONTANA WILDLIFE
FEDERATION
PO BOX 1175
HELENA MT 59624

Ellen Engstedt
MONTANA WOOD PRODUCTS
PO BOX 1149
HELENA MT 59624

Montana Land Reliance
Attn Jay Erickson
PO Box 355
Helena, MT 59624

Louis E. Hawkes, Executive
Director
Public Lands Access Assoc., Inc.
16 Cloninger Lane
Bozeman, MT 59715

Montana Coalition for Appropriate
Management of State Lands
Attn Jack Acheson
3210 Ottawa
Butte, MT 59701

Greater Yellowstone Coalition
P.O. Box 1874
Bozeman, MT 59771

Defenders of Wildlife
140 S. 4th St. W.
Missoula, MT 59801

Brad Johnson, Secretary of State
c/o Jeff Garrard
P.O. Box 202801
Helena, MT 59620-2801

Mike McGrath, Attorney General
c/o Jennifer Anders
215 N. Sanders
PO Box 201401
Helena, MT 59620-1401

Dept. of Environmental Quality
Attn: Tom Ellerhoff
PO Box 200901
Helena, MT 59620-0901

Bob Vogel
Montana School Boards Association
One South Montana Ave.
Helena, MT 59601

Harold Blattie
Montana Association of Counties
2715 Skyway Dr.
Helena, MT 59601

Bruce Bugbee
American Public Land Exchange
125 Bank Street
Suite 610
Missoula, MT 59802

Public Lands Access Assoc., Inc.
John Gibson
3028 Avenue F
Billings, MT 59102

Montana Coalition for Appropriate
Management of State Lands
Attn Jack Jones
3014 Irene St
Butte, MT 59701

Foundation for North American
Wild Sheep
720 Allen Ave.
Cody, WY 82414

Montana Bowhunters Association
4503 Barbara Lane
Missoula, MT 59803

John Morrison, State Auditor
c/o David Van Nise
840 Helena Ave
PO Box 4009
Helena, MT 59604-4009

State Industrial School Beneficiary
Mike Ferriter, Director
Department of Corrections
PO Box 201301
Helena MT 59620-1301

Dept of Transportation
Attn: Shane Minz
PO Box 201101
Helena, MT 59620-1101

Daniel Berube
27 Cedar Lake Dr.
Butte, MT 59701

Nancy Schlep
MT FARM BUREAU
FEDERATION
502 S 19th, SUITE 4
BOZEMAN MT 59715

Ray Marner
Matador Cattle Co.
9500 Blacktail Rd.
Dillon, MT 59725

Leslie Taylor
MSU Bozeman
P.O. Box 172440
Bozeman, MT 59717-0001

NELSON, STEVEN & JERRI ANNE
PO BOX 216
LINCOLN, MT 59619-0216

Jim Stone, Chairman
Blackfoot Challenge
PO Box 148
Ovando, MT 59854

Rosi Keller
Univ. of Montana
32 Campus Dr.
Missoula, MT 59812-0001

Robert Lydiard
9 SEIBROLD LN
CASCADE, MT 59421-8123

Greg Neudecker
US Fish & Wildlife Service
Benton Lake Wetland Mgt District
922 Bootlegger Trail
Great Falls, MT 59404

Hank Goetz
Blackfoot Challenge
PO Box 148
Ovando, MT 59854

Tony Schonnen
Skyline Sportsmen
Box 2
Ramsey, MT 59748

KOVALENKO, MICHAEL E
PO BOX 99
NEW YORK, NY 10014-0099



Blackfoot Challenge
PO Box 148
Ovando, MT 59854

Bee Hall
The Nature Conservancy
33 South Ewing, Suite 215
Helena, MT 59601

EXHIBIT C

Lander's Fork Building Envelope

SEC 18-T15N-R7W, PMM



No Build Zone Definition: This zone shall be defined as the prohibition of all buildings, structures, fences (except for wildlife friendly fencing) utilities (except underground utilities), storage, outbuildings or any other development. The No Build Zone does not preclude road construction.

EXHIBIT D

Wildlife Deed Reservations
FOR
76.3 acres in Lot 3_NE4SW4 of Sec. 18, Township 15 North,
Range 7 West

Grantor hereby specifically reserves to itself, its successors and assigns and may grant to the governmental entities set forth below and their successors and assigns the following rights and restricts the Property as follows:

Section 1. Barbecue Pits. Permanent barbecue pits are prohibited.

Section 2. Gardens. Gardens shall be fenced with at least one foot of fencing material below ground level and at least eight feet in height. The top rail shall be made of something other than wire to prevent wildlife from entanglement.

Section 3. Birdfeeders. All bird feeders shall be suspended on a cable or other device so that they are at least 12 feet above the ground and at least 4 feet from any tree, post or other structure that bears could climb.

Section 4. Fruit trees. The planting of any type of fruit tree is prohibited unless surrounded by a properly constructed and maintained electric fence. Any produce shall be harvested promptly and thoroughly to prevent the accumulation of rotting organic matter.

Section 5. Solid Waste. No part of the Property shall be used as a dumping ground. All solid waste shall be stored inside the home or garage and shall be contained in metal, plastic, or other suitable containers which have sufficiently tight-fitting covers to prevent entrance or destruction by bears or other wild animals, unless it is in a commercially produced bear-resistant container. Solid waste may be stored out of doors if it is in a commercially produced bear-resistant container. Solid waste shall not be accumulated for longer than seven days and must be removed every seven days. Solid waste must be covered when it is being transported. Burying or burning solid waste is prohibited.

Section 6. Feeding Wildlife. Intentional feeding of wildlife is prohibited (with the exception of birds, as set forth in Section 3 above) and violates state law (MCA 87-3-130). Salt blocks, mineral blocks and feeding platforms for deer or other wildlife are prohibited. Horse or livestock feed, such as hay, pellets and grain, shall be stored in a secured area or in commercially produced wildlife resistant containers. Pet food shall be stored indoors or in commercially produced wildlife resistant containers.

Section 7. Domestic Animals. All domestic animals shall be controlled to prevent them from chasing, stalking, killing, harming, or harassing wildlife and livestock and to prevent them from becoming prey for wildlife.

Section 8. Rabbits, chickens, turkey, pigs, sheep and goats. The keeping of rabbits, chickens, turkeys, pigs, sheep and goats is prohibited.

Section 9. Apiaries. Apiaries shall be surrounded by electric fencing.

Section 10. Enforcement. Grantor reserves to itself and its successors, grantees and assigns the right to enforce these Deed Reservations. Enforcement of these Deed Reservations can be pursued through any proceeding at law or in equity. Remedies sought may include, but are not limited to, temporary restraining orders, preliminary injunctions, permanent injunctions, and actions to bring properties into compliance with these Deed Reservations.

Grantor may enter into memoranda of understanding or agreements pursuant to which it may assign or grant rights and options to enforce these Deed Reservations with the following governmental entities and no other persons or entities; Lewis and Clark County, the Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks, and the Department of Interior through the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. Any such memoranda of understanding or agreements may provide that Grantor reserves the right to enforce these Deed Reservations. Any such memoranda or agreement shall be executed in recordable form and recorded in the County or Counties in which any property encumbered by these Deed Reservations is located.

Section 11. Waiver. None of the parties reserving the right or to whom the right to enforce these Deed Reservations has been or may be assigned or granted are required to enforce them and may elect to waive enforcement. Failure to enforce these Deed Reservations by any party having or being assigned or granted the right to enforce shall in no way be deemed a waiver of the right to do so thereafter. Failure to enforce any provision contained in these Deed Reservations shall not

operate as a waiver of any such provision or of any other provision of these Deed Reservations. No cause of action by any third party shall occur against Grantor or any entity to whom the right to enforce has been assigned or granted as a result of any decision regarding enforcement of these Deed Reservations. Grantor may terminate its rights to enforce these Deed Reservations at any time by giving notice to the other parties to whom Grantor may have assigned or granted the right and option to enforce these Deed Reservations.

Section 12. Severability. Invalidity or unenforceability of any provision, in whole or in part, contained in these Deed Reservations shall not affect the validity or enforceability of any other provision which shall remain in full force and effect.

Section 13. Amendment and Termination. These Deed Reservations may be amended or terminated upon the written concurrence of 75% of those parties having enforcement rights under Section 10 hereunder, provided, however, that no party's obligations can be increased without its express written consent.

Section 14. Successors and Assigns. The provisions contained in these Deed Reservations shall be binding upon and shall inure to the benefit of Grantor and its respective heirs, personal representatives, successors, grantees and assigns.

Section 15. Captions and Headings. The captions and headings in this instrument are for convenience only and shall not be considered in construing any provisions of these Deed Reservations.

Section 16. Educational Information. Should the Property be sold or rented, the Grantor shall deliver the Educational Information attached as Exhibit A hereto, and subsequent amendments to, modifications and replacements thereof to the buyer.

Section 17. Duration of Deed Reservations: The provisions of these Deed Reservations are intended to be easements and covenants running with the land, and are intended to be perpetual, except as amended or terminated as provided in Section 13. These Deed Reservations shall be included in any deed transferring ownership or lease transferring possession of the Property.

Section 18. Effect of Provisions of Deed Reservations: Each provision contained in these Deed Reservations, and any agreement, promise, covenant and undertaking to comply with each provision contained in these Deed Reservations, and any necessary exception or reservation or grant of title, estate, right or interest to effectuate any provision contained in these Deed Reservations: (a) shall be deemed incorporated in each deed or other instrument by which any right, title or interest in the Property described above is granted, devised, assigned, or conveyed, whether or not set forth or referred to in such deed or other instrument; (b) shall, by virtue of acceptance of any right, title or interest in the Property described above, be deemed accepted, ratified, adopted and declared as a personal covenant of the Owner of the Property, and as a personal covenant, shall be binding on such Owner and such Owner's heirs, personal representatives, successors and assigns; and (c) shall be deemed a real covenant by Grantor, for itself, its successors and assigns, and also an equitable servitude, running, in each case, as a burden with and upon the title to the Property.

EXHIBIT A

EDUCATIONAL INFORMATION

Grantor recognizes that wildlife and the natural environment are important amenities and the continued protection and proliferation thereof should be encouraged in the human development and use of private land in the Lincoln Valley; and

The Property contains resources that are important to the people of the United States; and

Grantor has placed Deed Reservations, Grants and Restrictions (the “Deed Reservations”) upon the Property for the use and benefit of wildlife, the United States, Lewis and Clark County, Montana, and future owners and for the use and benefit of wildlife on other property managed by Montana DNRC in Lewis and Clark County, Montana; and

The Deed Reservations are designed and intended to protect wildlife and its natural habitat in the development of private property, to reduce conflicts between humans and wildlife, and to reserve and grant the right to take necessary action to enforce these Deed Reservations.

The following information is provided for educational purposes only and for no other purpose. It is not intended that the information provided herein be enforced against the owner of any of the property encumbered by the Deed Reservations. This educational information, however, may be helpful in furthering the intent of the Deed Reservations.

Section 1. Barbecue Pits. Residual odors of cooked meat and grease drippings in permanent barbecue pits attract bears to home sites and habituate them to humans, thereby endangering bears, other wildlife, livestock and humans. Portable barbecue grills should be cleaned after each use and stored indoors when not in use.

Section 2. Landscaping. Landscaping palatable to deer will encourage them to live in close proximity to people. When deer are present, their natural predators – including the mountain lion, wolf, bear and coyote – will follow. Native vegetation should be used for landscaping and revegetation so as to not encourage deer browsing. If ornamental plants are used, their use should be limited and they should be fenced in order to minimize damage. Landscaping should be designed to reduce or eliminate any areas that could hide predators.

Section 3. Gardens. Vegetables and herbs found in gardens are attractive to both deer and bears. Consult with the Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks on the proper techniques to develop and maintain effective electric fences when used. For other areas of the property, if electric fencing is used, it shall be regularly monitored to ensure proper use and function.

Section 4. Rotting Organic Matter and Compost Piles. Rotting organic matter is a prime wildlife attractant. Its presence endangers bears, other wildlife, livestock and humans. All garden produce, fruit trees and berry producing shrubs should be promptly and thoroughly harvested so as to prevent the accumulation of rotting organic matter. Compost piles should be surrounded by a properly maintained and effective electric fence or non-electric fence that is at least one foot of fencing material below ground level and at least eight feet in height. The top rail should be made of something other than wire to prevent wildlife from entanglement.

Section 5. Birdfeeders. Birdseed and nectar or sugar water feeders for hummingbirds are natural food sources for bears and other wildlife. Bears will go to great lengths to reach this type of food, climbing trees, climbing on decks and tearing down upright structures.

Section 6. Fruit trees. Fruit trees are a major wildlife attractant.

Section 7. Solid Waste. Human garbage that is available to wildlife allows them to become food conditioned and to lose their natural fear of people. This can result in an animal that is considered a nuisance or a danger and that may have to be destroyed. It can also endanger humans, livestock and other wildlife.

Section 8. Feeding Wildlife. Artificial feeding of wildlife attracts both prey and predator species to human habitats and is prohibited by Section 87-3-103 Montana Code Annotated.

Section 9. Domestic Animals. Uncontrolled animals may chase wildlife and livestock. House cats may stalk and kill many species of birds and small mammals. Harassment of wildlife by domestic animals causes unnecessary energy expenditures and can displace native wildlife to less suitable habitats. It is a violation of state and local law to allow dogs to be at large in Lewis and Clark County (Lewis and Clark County Dog Control Ordinance and Section 7-23-2108 Montana Code Annotated). Dogs that harass livestock are considered a public nuisance and may be killed immediately by the owner of the livestock (section 81-7-401 Montana Code Annotated.) The owner of a dog that kills livestock may also be liable to the owner of livestock for liquidated damages (Section 81-7-402 Montana Code Annotated). It is also a violation of state law to allow dogs to chase, stalk, pursue, attack or kill hooved game animals. Any peace officer who witnesses a dog chasing, stalking, pursuing, attacking or killing a hooved game animal may destroy the dog on either public or private land (Section 87-3-124 MCA). Lastly, uncontrolled domestic animals may become prey for wildlife.

Section 10. Rabbits, chickens, turkeys, pigs, sheep and goats have no defense against predators and will attract predators with associated mortality and harm to both species and possibly humans. The common methods of feeding these animals can be serious attractants to many wildlife species.

Section 11. Apiaries. Apiaries will attract bears . Before an apiary is located on the property, the owner of the bee hive(s) should first contact the Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks to consult on plans to avoid conflicts with bears.

Section 12. Fencing. Landowners must be aware that the Lincoln Valley is important wildlife habitat and fencing should be compatible with the needs of wildlife to move across the landscape. The movement patterns of deer, elk, moose, bears and mountain lions should be taken into account if fencing is required. Contact the Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks to discuss fencing types compatible with wildlife movements.

Section 13. Brochures. Public agencies, non-profit groups and businesses have developed information for the use of landowners living in proximity to wildlife. Information may be obtained from the Missoula Office of Planning and Grants, 435 Ryman, Missoula, MT 59801, (406) 523-4657 and the Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks.


EXHIBIT E


This grant is made subject to the following terms:

Provided, however, that the right-of-way granted herein is not exclusive and does not interfere with the Grantor and its successors or assigns, in their right, at all times to go upon, cross and recross the land covered by said right-of-way, at any point, for any and all purposes in a manner that will not unreasonably interfere with the rights granted to the Grantee.

Provide, however, that Grantor reserves the right to limit the access across said right-of-way strip to the State of Montana, and its officers in the performance of their duties, to purchasers of State timber or other forest products and to future licensees or lessees of State land.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, Grantor caused their names to be hereunto affixed on the day and year first above written,



Robert E. Lydiard



Francis Neva Lydiard

STATE OF MONTANA }
COUNTY OF Lewis & Clark } ss

On this 5 day of June in the year 1967, before me, a Notary Public, personally appeared Robert E. and Francis Neva Lydiard known to me to be the person that executed the within instrument.

(SEAL)


Notary Public for the State of Montana
Residing at Bozeman, MT
My Commission expires 8-20-67



commencing at the above mentioned CIP corner to the East line of Section 11, (2000 x 100.00 = 200,000) and a bearing of $25^{\circ} 52' 30''$ E to the frequency of eight-sided survey, then then to the East.

	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3
		(See fig 1)	(See fig 1)
Flow	1.0	0.475 L	0.6 L
Res. (ml/g)	2.1	0.580 L/g	0.620 L/g
	2.0	0.575 L/g	0.610 L/g
	4.0	0.560 L/g	0.600 L/g
	5.0	0.550 L/g	0.590 L/g
	10.0	0.530 L/g	0.560 L/g
mod. flow	3.0	0.550 L/g	0.570 L/g

best point of viewing is a cluster of trees just in a clearing of
Hickory on the hillside from where the bridge is viewed.

I know, and I am not alone. In a recent report, approximately 10 percent of the population in the United States is estimated to have a chronic condition. This is a significant increase from the 5 percent reported in the 1990s. The report also found that the majority of people with chronic conditions are aged 65 and older, and that the majority of people with chronic conditions are female.

1087K H. GORR

Draft

interoffice

MEMORANDUM

to: Kevin Chappell
 from: Bob Storer
 subject: Lydiard Land Exchange Survey
 date: June 25, 1998

On June 18, 1998 I met Bill Cyr from our Lincoln office and together we met with Bob Lydiard at the site of the road survey done for the Lydiard land exchange (Sec 18 T15N-R7W) in 1967. Our purpose was to verify the location of the road that was surveyed by Jim Kuechmann and I at the time of the land exchange.

Bob Lydiard outlined that Mr Solvie (new State leasee) had arranged for a person (Bob Hayes - consultant forester) to establish the approximate boundary line between State and Lydiard property in preparation for construction of a boundary fence. Bob Lydiard showed us the location of the markers set by Bob Hayes. In order to verify the true boundary between the State and Lydiard we proceeded to search for the legal property corners on the west side of Section 18.

We found an established pin and cap at the southwest corner of the section. This corner was an aluminum cap on a rebar pin inscribed as follows:

DITTO
 T15N
 13 | 18
 R8W ----- R7W
 24 | 19
 297.5

The corner is located in a pile of rocks 6' north of an old jackleg fence. There is a metal location poster on the north side of a fence post on this fence line dated 1976 DITTO. There is also a N/S fence line (barbed wire) located 59 1/2' west of this corner. Original survey notes indicate the N/S dimension of the west section line for section 18 is a full mile (5,280').

From this corner we proceeded north on a random line between sections 13 & 18. We measured distance with a 300' cloth tape. At 1,220 feet we placed a temporary pin in the ground to reference the approximate location of the south 1/4 corner (land traversed is open level grassland). Proceeded further north on said random line not measuring distance (as we cross hills and enter timber). Cross N/S fence approximately 300 feet short of estimated location of the west quarter corner to section. Find west quarter corner (aluminum cap on rebar). Corner pin is inside a 2" dia pipe (a 2' length of pipe acts as a sleeve over the pin and survey cap) and is located about 2' west of N/S fence and about 20' south of fence intersection with E/W fence.

Kevin Chappell
Page 2
June 25, 1998


Measure perpendicular offset from our random line to west quarter corner (67' east to corner - This equates to 1 1/4 degree angle correction in 1/4 mile run).

	DITTO	
	1/4	
T15N	S15, S18	T15N
R8W		R7W
	2915	

Walked back to location of temporary 1/16 corner. Offset 33 3/4' to the east to true line and set new pin for temporary 1/16th corner. Observed rock pile on line approximately 5 chains north of said 1/16th corner. This is the same rock pile we used as the 1/16th corner for the original road survey in 1987. I now believe this point is a property corner for a change in ownership in section 13. Measured from the rock pile to the temporary 1/16th corner - 347'. Assumed there may have been error in measurement with 300' cloth tape and decided to move our unofficial 1/16 corner pin 17' north (probably too much - in hindsight I would guess 12' would be better). This point is approximately 2' north of a flagline established by Selvie for the property boundary between Lydiard and State.

From this 1/16 corner Bill and I turned a 90 angle and proceeded east on the boundary between DNRC and Lydiard. We stopped after 725 feet (1/4 of the boundary line) and determined that the flagline was still within 3' of where we projected the boundary should be.

Went back to the 1/16th corner and surveyed the existing access road as follows; from 1/16 corner proceeded north 9 degrees west a distance of 97' to a point where road centerline enters state land, thence south 57.5 degrees east a distance of 181' to a point where road centerline leaves state land, thence north 90 degrees west a distance of 152' along the property line back to the point of beginning (1/16th corner). The attached closed traverse computation shows an error of closure of 1 in 614.



CRATERE CONCENTRATION AND ADJUSTMENT CONCENTR. ETC.

6/25/78


FOR 170120 ROAD SURVEY

STAGE	CONCENTR.	CONCENTR.	CONCENTR.	CONCENTR.	CONCENTR.	CONCENTR.
	(ADJUSTED)	170120	170120	170120	170120	170120
1 - 3	1.90	97.00	97.00	-0.147	0.000	0.000
1 - 3	170.00	181.00	-11.148	190.179	19.000	-0.147
1 - 1	170.00	150.00	0.000	-167.101	-0.147	150.00
		150.00	-0.147	0.000		

CONCENTR. = 0.147 170120
 CONCENTR. = 1.14 170120
 CONCENTR. = 0.147 170120
 CONCENTR. = 1.14 170120
 CONCENTR. = 0.147 170120
 CONCENTR. = 1.14 170120

W022E75J0 WAF 007F... 0021 2Y0:460 3060 518737

Start



IF 31AGE. 1 : 7532

3 240000 = 1 1000 180 034000